

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the Office Action dated November 17, 2009, claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 were rejected.

Claims 1, 21, 34 and 42 are hereby amended to recite inherent aspects as originally claimed.

Based on the above Amendment and following Remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection are requested.

### **Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement**

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement including addition reference(s) for consideration is submitted herewith. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate consideration of the reference(s) in the next communication to Applicants.

### **Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,203,186 (“Fuller”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,655,013 (“Gainsboro”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, specifically, among other, recites:

. . . a second processor-based system communicating with said first processor-based system via a digital data link and disposed remotely from said prison facility, said second processor-based system establishing calls to called parties requested by the one or more of the plurality of telephone terminals, the second processor-based system converting the first voice signals for transmission over a carrier network responsive to receiving the first voice signals via the digital data link, the second processor-based system converting second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice signals from the called parties received via the carrier network to second VoIP voice signals for transmission to the first processor-based

system via the digital data link, the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls. (emphasis added).

Per claim 1, the call processing system includes a first processor-based system and a second processor-based system. The second processor-based system receives first voice signals from the first processor-based system via a digital data link, converts the first voice signals and transmits the first voice signals over a carrier network. The second processor-based system also performs the functions of (i) receiving second non-VoIP voice signals from the carrier network and converting the second non-VoIP voice signals into second VoIP voice signals, and (ii) detecting fraudulent or unauthorized call activity by monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals.

The feature of “a second processor-based system communicating with said first processor-based system via a digital data link and disposed remotely from said prison facility,” as recited in claim 1, is advantageous, among other reasons, because a large number of line connections from prison systems to a PSTN (Public Switched Telephone Network) can be eliminated, and existing data networks in the prison systems can be leveraged to provide call services efficiently. See, for example, paragraph [0046] of the specification.

None of the cited references disclose the feature of “a second processor-based system communicating with said first processor-based system via a digital data link and disposed remotely from said first processor-based system,” as recited in claim 1, as amended. First, Fuller fails to disclose this feature. In Fuller, ADSL modem 22 in a subscriber premises communicates with DSLAM (DSL Access MUX) 40 via DSL telephone connections 30, 32, 34. Although “DSL” is an acronym for “Digital Subscriber Line,” signals passed over the DSL telephone connections are analog signals and not digital signals. See Fuller, col. 6, ll. 17-31. More specifically, DSL carries high-frequency sinusoidal carrier wave which is a form of an

analog signal. Hence, ADSL model 22 and DSLAM 40 does not communicate via “a digital data link,” as recited in claim 1. Further, although voice gateway 44 and DSLAM 40 are connected via Ethernet connection (see Fuller, col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 3), it appears that voice gateway 44 and DSLAM 40 are provided in the same facility of a local telephone carrier or an affiliated Internet access provider. Hence, voice gateway 44 and DSLAM 40 in Fuller are not “disposed remotely” from each other. Nowhere in Fuller does it disclose any processor-based systems located remotely from each other and communicating via a digital data link.

Nor does Gainsboro disclose this feature. Gainsboro is based on analog/POTS system to service multiple telephones. With respect to digital connection, Gainsboro at best discloses multi-port serial card 4 that interfaces TMU 2 to CCU 3, administrative terminals 5a, 5b, and a remote terminal 7 via digital connections. See Gainsboro col. 6, ll. 36-43. But in Gainsboro, TMU 2 communicates with outside telephone line 8 via analog line, and hence, Gainsboro fails to disclose any processor-based systems located remotely from each other and communicating via a digital data link.

Therefore, none of the cited references disclose the feature of “a second processor-based system communicating with said first processor-based system via a digital data link and disposed remotely from said first processor-based system,” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Claims 2-14, 16, 19 and 41 depend from claim 1; and therefore, the arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 2-14, 16, 19 and 41. Accordingly, claims 2-14, 16, 19 and 41 are also patentably distinguishable from Fuller and Gainsboro.

Similarly, independent claim 21, as amended, recites the feature of “a call processing system communicating with a plurality of processor-based systems via digital data links, each processor-based system associated with a prison facility, the call processing system located remotely from at least one of the plurality of the processor-based systems . . . .” Therefore,

essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 21 and its dependent claims 22, 24, 30-32 and 42. Accordingly, claims 22, 24, 30-32 and 42 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Fuller and Gainsboro.

Independent claim 34 also recites the feature of “in a centralized call processing system . . . communicating with a plurality of processor-based systems via digital data links, each process-based system collecting call signals for establishing calls from telephone terminals in a prison facility . . . .” Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 34 and its dependent claims 36, 38-40 and 43. Accordingly, claims 34 and its dependent claims 36, 38-40 and 43 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Fuller and Gainsboro.

Based on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-40 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

### **Conclusion**

Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: February 12, 2010

/Dohyun Ahn/  
Dohyun Ahn, Reg. No. 63,237  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7291  
Fax: (650) 938-5200